

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 25, 2003. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-12, 14, 15, and 17-22 were pending in this Patent Application. The Examiner rejected all pending claims. Claims 1, 2, 4, 13, 17, 19, 20, and 22 have been amended. Claims 14 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 112 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claim 1, stating that the claim terms "the event," "the emergency event," and "the profile" each lack antecedent basis. In response, Applicant amends "the event" and "the emergency event" of Claim 1 to read "the public safety event" to overcome this rejection. Further, Applicant amends "the profile" of Claim 1 to read "the subscriber profile" to overcome this rejection. Favorable action is requested.

The Examiner rejects Claims 4 and 12, stating that claim terms "the event" and "the emergency event" in each of these claims lack antecedent basis. In response, Applicant amends "the event" and "the emergency event" of Claims 4 and 12 to read "the public safety event" to overcome these rejections. Favorable action is requested.

The Examiner rejects Claim 20, stating that the claim terms "the event" and "the profile" each lack antecedent basis. In response, Applicant amends "the event" and "the profile" of Claim 20 to read "the public safety event" and "the subscriber profile," respectively, to overcome these rejections. Favorable action is requested.

The Examiner rejects Claims 17 and 19, stating that the claim term "the event" in each of these claims lacks antecedent basis. Further, the Examiner rejects Claim 17, stating that the claim term "the profile" lacks antecedent basis. In response, Applicant amends "the event" in Claims 17 and 19 to read "the crime event" and "the profile" in Claim 17 to read "the subscriber profile" to overcome these rejections. Favorable action is requested.

Claims 14 and 15 have been rejected because Claim 13, from which Claims 14 and 15 depend, has been cancelled previously. To advance the prosecution of this case, Applicant cancels Claims 14 and 15.

Claim 22 has been amended to correct the typographical error noted by the Examiner.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-15, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,173,284 B1 issued to Brown ("*Brown*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,912,947 issued to Langsenkamp, et al. ("*Langsenkamp*"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brown*, *Langsenkamp*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,893,091 issued to Hunt et al. ("*Hunt*"). Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brown*, *Langsenkamp*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,510,978 issued to Colgan, et al. ("*Colgan*"). Applicant traverses these rejections for reasons stated below.

Amended Claim 1 is allowable over *Brown* and *Langsenkamp* because neither of these references teaches or suggests "determining whether a subscriber associated with the subscriber profile has been granted access to the matched public safety event based on a type associated with the subscriber profile, the type indicating whether a particular portion of information concerning the matched public safety event is to be transmitted to the subscriber in response to receiving a request to access the information from the subscriber," as recited by amended Claim 1. In the previous Office Action, the Examiner identified col. 17, line 64 – col. 18, line 67 of *Langsenkamp* as showing the previous version of this limitation. Applicant does not concede that the Examiner is correct in this regard. But to advance the prosecution of this case, Applicant amends Claim 1 and asserts that this amended limitation is clearly not shown by the identified portion of *Langsenkamp*.

Brown teaches a way in which a user, such as a police officer, may search through police records using a remote device. *Langsenkamp* teaches a public notification system where the system calls persons who had previously indicated that they would like to receive calls concerning certain events, such as theft, car-jacking, and kidnapping. A person receiving a call from the system of *Langsenkamp* are referred to as a "callee." The system of *Langsenkamp* gives a callee control over when and what information will be delivered to the callee via phone. A callee may also incorporate a password with each call that they receive from the system so that the callee may prevent certain persons, such as the children of the callee, from receiving the information.

Unlike the invention of Claim 1, the public alert system in *Langsenkamp* does not restrict a callee from accessing any information available in the system. Rather, the callee is allowed to filter information to be received by selecting the type of desired information and indicating a desired time of receipt. For example, the identified portion of *Langsenkamp*

*US-02
LICENSING
REMARKS (W/UTX)
Anchorage
Vetek*

describes a public alert system where a callee may identify the type of crime the callee is interested in learning about and assign a password to the call that may be received. In sum, as stated in *Langsenkamp*, "the interactive capability of the automated phone calling system of the present invention gives the callee control over the receipt of such calls." [emphasis added] (See col. 18, lines 33-35.) Because the callee already has access to all information that the system has to offer, there is no need for the system in *Langsenkamp* to "determin[e] whether a subscriber . . . has been granted access to the matched public safety event . . ." [emphasis added]. Any information not received by the callee is due to a preference expressed by the callee, not due to a restriction imposed on the callee by the system.

Further, the use of password does not determine whether the callee has access to information. Again, the callee already has access to all the information and a password is a tool that the callee may use to prevent some persons who may answer the callee's phone from receiving the information (i.e. children). Stated in other words, a password is a self-imposed identity verification means for ensuring that only the callee and anyone designated by the callee will receive the information.

Additionally, nothing in either *Langsenkamp* or *Brown* discloses a type indicated in a subscriber profile that indicates whether a particular portion of information is to be transmitted to the subscriber in response to receiving a request to access the information from the subscriber as recited in amended Claim 1. Rather, *Langsenkamp* discloses a callee who receives a call that includes all information concerning an event that was pre-selected by the callee. *Langsenkamp* and/or *Brown* does not disclose a scenario where only portions of information concerning an event is transmitted to a subscriber in response to a request to receive information.

Claim 1 is allowable also because neither *Brown* nor *Langsenkamp* teaches or suggests "generating a notification in response to a subscriber profile and the public safety event," as recited by Claim 1. The Examiner has stated in the previous Office Action that this limitation is shown in col. 5, line 1 – col. 6, line 6 of *Brown*. This is incorrect. In the identified excerpt, *Brown* teaches a database module 16 that is operable to generate a notification signal if a match occurs between the query information provided by a user and a police record kept in a database 18. However, a police record is not a subscriber profile, as recited in Claim 1. As indicated by other limitations of Claim 1, the phrase "subscriber profile" indicates a profile of a subscriber, such as a police officer, who may be granted access to certain information concerning a public safety event, such as information concerning a murder. However, a police record in *Brown* is not a description of a subscriber who may be granted access to information concerning a public

safety event. Rather, a police record is a profile of a criminal. Nothing in *Brown* suggests giving access to information concerning a public safety event, such as a crime, to a criminal. Thus, the identified portion of *Brown* does not show this missing limitation and Claim 1 is allowable. Favorable action is requested.

For reasons analogous to those provided in conjunction with Claim 1, Claims 17 and 20 are also allowable. Favorable action is requested.

As depending from allowable independent Claim 1, Claims 2-12, 21, and 22 are also allowable. Claim 12 is allowable also because neither *Brown* nor *Langsenkamp* teaches or suggests "determining whether a media subscriber associated with the media generic profile has access to the matched public safety events," as recited by Claim 12. The Examiner identifies col. 7, line 7 – col. 8, line 49 of *Brown* as showing this limitation. This is incorrect. The identified portion in fact teaches a way in which a user can search through a database using particular characteristics of an ongoing event. This portion says nothing about determining whether a media subscriber, such as a member of the media, has access to a matched public safety event. The Examiner also identifies col. 2, lines 30-56 of *Langsenkamp* as showing this limitation. This is incorrect. The identified portion in fact teaches creating, updating and sharing records regarding particular events. The Examiner also identifies col. 17, line 64 – col. 18, line 67 of *Langsenkamp* as showing this limitation. This is incorrect. The identified portion in fact teaches how an interactive automated phone calling system allows a callee to have control over what information should be communicated to the callee. However, none of these portions show determining whether a media subscriber has access to a matched public safety event.

As depending from allowable independent Claim 17, dependent Claims 18 and 19 are also allowable. Favorable action is requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts, LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTT S L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Brian W. Oaks
Reg. No. 44,981

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980

Tel. (214) 953-6986
Fax. (214) 661-4986
brian.oaks@bakerbotts.com

Date: June 25, 2003